

Serial No. 09/838,376

Steven Edward Atkin

Page 11 of 14

Section IV:
AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121
REMARKS

Interview Request

Applicant request a telephone interview with the Examiner following receipt of the present amendment and reply, and prior to issuance of the next Office Action, in order to consider any suggestion the Examiner may have regarding claim language and terminology. Examiner may contact the applicant's agent, Robert H. Frantz, at 405-812-5613, to indicate a time and day of the examiner's convenience for the interview.

If Examiner finds that the present amendment and reply places the application in a condition for allowance, Examiner may disregard this request for an interview.

Objections to the Specification and Claims

In the Office Action, an objection to the specification regarding the Cross-Reference to Related Applications and Incorporation by Reference not including the serial number and filing date of the referenced US patent application. The present amendment adds the serial number and filing date of the related and incorporated patent application, which is currently pending before the USPTO.

Also in the Office Action, an objection to Claim 1 with respect to a grammatical error "a Unicode character streams" was made, which been corrected by the present amendment.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of these objections is requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action, claims 1 - 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for including terms (or depending on a claim which includes a term) which lack antecedent bases, specifically "the character stream" and "the tag identifier". The present amendment has corrected the references to these items in claims 1, 9, and 17. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

Serial No. 09/838,376

Steven Edward Atkin

Page 12 of 14

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1 - 3, 6, 8 - 11, 14, 16-19, 22 and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by the document "Unicode in XML and Other Markup Languages" by Durst, et al, (hereinafter "Durst"), as provided by applicant via an IDS, in view of applicant's description of the background of the art.

However, both applicant's description of this document in our disclosure, and the document itself have been misinterpreted with respect to a significant differences between our invention and the subject matter of the document.

Durst is describing a proposal as to methods and mechanisms for embedding and handling Unicode into markup language documents. In other words, the base or main data structure is originally a markup language, such as XML, and Durst's objective is to define how Unicode data can be embedded into the markup language. Consider, for example, the title of the document, "Unicode in XML and Other Markup Languages", which implies Unicode is being inserted into XML or another markup language. This is consistent with the rest of the Durst document, and especially at the following statements:

3. Suitability of Characters in Markup

This section discusses the suitability of Unicode characters for use in markup, with particular emphasis to format characters, as well as characters that have been deprecated. (Durst, page 5, emphasis added)

...

3.1 Characters not suitable for use with markup

The following table contains the characters currently considered not suitable for use with markup in XML or HTML. (Durst page 6, emphasis added)

...

3.3 Line and Paragraph Separator, U+2028..U+2029

...

Problems when used in markup: Including these characters in markup text does not work where it would duplicate the existing markup commands for delimiting paragraphs and lines. (Durst, page 7, emphasis added)

...

Serial No. 09/838,376

Steven Edward Atkin

Page 13 of 14

3.4 Bidi embedding controls (LRE, RLE, LRO, RLO, PDF), U+202A .. U+202E

...

Problems when used in markup: These characters duplicate available markup, which is better suited to handle the stateful nature of their effect. (Durst page 8, emphasis added)

Applicant's description of Durst's paper accurately reflected that Durst's proposal examines the problems of embedding Unicode characters into markup language. Applicant has not admitted or stated that Durst describes embedding metadata into Unicode character streams (e.g. essentially the opposite of the Durst proposal).

Please note that we originally claimed inserting metatags into a Unicode data stream, not inserting Unicode characters into a markup language. We have amended our claims to clarify this distinction, which is not taught or suggested by Durst. Additionally, Durst's proposal does not address or solve the problem of the present invention (e.g. recasting the present collection of convoluted, unused and unimplementable Unicode algorithms into a more manageable, detectable and reversible set of methods which are extensible, without requiring registration of new tag identifiers with protocol authorities, while allowing an arbitrary number of display control parameters to be used). Durst instead addresses a problem of markup language documents which incorporate Unicode characters.

Also in the Office Action, it was held that our second step or element of our independent claims 1, 9, and 17 (e.g. inserting tag separators between adjacent metatags) is taught by Durst as follows:

3.3 Line and Paragraph Separator, U+2028..U+2029

Short description: The line and paragraph separator provide unambiguous means to denote hard line breaks (Durst's page 7)

However, our "tag separators" are not the same as Durst's "separator tags", and have not been defined as "page separators", "line separators", or "hard line breaks" as Durst has done.

Instead, our "tag separators" have been defined as a new Unicode character (pg. 22 line 20, pg. 23 lines 5 and 16), not a tag, which is inserted between adjacent metatags (not between

Serial No. 09/838,376

Steven Edward Atkin

Page 14 of 14

pages or lines). We have disclosed a preferred character for such a tag separator, a vertical bar character "|" (pg. 25, line 2).

To emphasize and clarify this step, element or limitation, we have amended our independent claims 1, 9 and 17 to specify insertion of a tag separator character, which is not taught or suggested by the cited art.

As such and in view of the present amendment, the combination or modification of the references in the manner suggested by the examiner does not teach all the claimed elements, steps, or restrictions. MPEP §2143.03 states:

All Claim Limitations Must Be Taught or Suggested. To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

For these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of of Claims 1, 9, and 17.

Also in the Office Action, claims 4 - 5, 7, 12 - 13, 15, 20 - 21, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Durst in view of applicant's disclosure of the background of the invention, in further view of "Unicode Standard Annex #9 - The Bidirectional Algorithm" by Davis (hereinafter "Davis"). These claims depend from Claims 1, 9 and 17, and Davis does not teach the steps, elements, or limitations as discussed in the foregoing paragraphs.

As such, Durst in view of applicant's disclosure of the background of the invention fails to teach all steps, elements or limitations as claimed. For these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections, and allowance of claims. 4 - 5, 7, 12 - 13, 15, 20 - 21, and 23.

###